

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 remain in the application for consideration by the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding restriction requirement are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Office Action alleges that the application includes claims to be patentably distinct groups including Group I, Claims 1-4, drawn to a Noise Shape with dither generator, Group II, Claims 5-9, drawn to a Clock modulator; Group III, Claim 10, drawn to a detection with error signal; Group IV, Claims 11-16, drawn to timing control generation; Group V, Claims 19-20, drawn to a Power Supply; Group VI, Claims 21-22, drawn to a Half-bridge; and Group VII, Claim 23, drawn to over current protection.

At the onset, Applicant(s) note(s) that 35 U.S.C. § 121, the basis for a restriction requirement, provides for restriction only if two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. While § 802.01 of the MPEP indicates that a restriction between independent or distinct inventions is permissible, such section of the MPEP is clearly erroneous in view of the plain and unambiguous language of 35 U.S.C. § 121.

A review of the Office Action reveals that the Examiner has failed to clearly indicate how the subject matter recited in the claims in issue relating to the respective groups represents both independent and distinct inventions as required by 35 U.S.C. § 121.

In this connection, the above noted section of the MPEP defines the term "independent" as meaning that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed. That is, they are unconnected in design, operation or effect. Surely, the Examiner is not contending that the respective embodiments recited in the claims in issue have no undisclosed relationship, for if such were the case, the

Examiner's contention is clearly without merit, as a review of the instant application reveals.

Further, presuming *arguendo* that the Examiner could establish that the subject matter recited in the claims in issue relates to both, independent and distinct inventions, as required by statute, once again, Applicant(s) note(s) that, as pointed out by § 803 of the MPEP, if a search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine the application on the merits, even though the application includes claims of two distinct or independent inventions.

A review of the Office Action reveals that the Examiner has failed to provide any indication as to how or why a search and examination of all 24 claims in the instant application, would create a serious burden on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

In order to comply with the Examiner's requirement, Applicant(s) provisionally elect(s), with traverse, for prosecution on the merits, Group I, Claims 1-4, which are drawn to a Noise Shape with dither generator.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested, and an early and favorable action upon all the claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant(s) petition(s) for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-5633

FAX RECEIVED

APR 24 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800